

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,537	10/30/2000	Walter L. Moden	2687.3US (94-305.3)	8772
75	90 07/25/2002			
James R. Duzan			EXAMINER	
Trask Britt			BROCK II, PAUL E	
P.O. Box 2550 Salt Lake City,	IIT 94110			
San Lake City,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		,	2815	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2002	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		m
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/699,537	MODEN, WALTER L.
navioury nation.	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul E Brock II	2815
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme opeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
PERIOD FOI	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the peee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date	xpire later than SIX MONTHS from to WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTI The date on which the petition under period of extension and the correspon	the mailing date of the final rejection.  HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  der 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension adding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension
e) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	e Office later than three months afte	
<ul> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell</li> <li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37</li> </ul>		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or s	search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	ote below);	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the applicat issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ion in better form for appeal l	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can NOTE:	nceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.
B. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ould be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ reques application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NOT place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	ows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16 and 26-39</u> .		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

10. Other: \_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments with regard to Eide and Kohno are not persuasive because there is no recitation of "bond wires [which are formed] outward toward the chip periphery" in the claims. Therefore the rejection is proper. With regard to all other arguments, the applicant is referred to the final office action dated May 8, 2002.

SHEILA V. CLARK PRIMARY EXAMINER

2